DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 704 TM 870 091

AUTHOR Kirst, Michael W.
TITLE Roles, Governance, and Multiple Uses for a New NAEP.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 20p.; One of 46 papers commissioned by the Study Group on the National Assessment of Student Achievement and cited in Appendix B to their final report "The Nation's Report Card" (TM 870 049). For other papers in this group, see TM 870 050-094.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Testing; *Educational Assessment; Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; *Government Role; *Measurement Objectives; *National Surveys; Policy Formation; State School District Relationship; Testing Programs; *Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *National Assessment of Educational Progress

ABSTRACT

Commissioned papers on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) have recommended new roles for NAEP, but its system of governance, as conceived in the 1960s, was not designed for all these functions. The NAEP Policy Committee, revised in 1978, never envisioned the current interest in a linkage system relating local and state assessments of academic achievement to NAEP curricular domains and measurement system. New technologies such as item response theory (IRT) make it feasible to use domain descriptions and item pools for such linkages. The current law, Public Law 95-561 as amended in 1981, needs to be augmented with the new functions envisioned by the Study Group; Section 1242, specifying the Assessment Policy Committee (APC) should be revised to encompass fair comparisons among states and local school districts. The APC membership should also reflect the new emphasis. Members should be appointed by the Secretary of Education, rather than by the organization conducting the assessment. The APC, ideally housed within the Federal Government, would govern the activities of the contractor who administers and analyzes the testing. Sections of Public Law 95-561 and Public Law 98-511, a description of The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (created by Congress in 1959), and a summary of the structure of the APC are appended. (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279704

Roles, Governance, and Multiple Uses for a New NAEP

Michael W. Kirst

Stanford University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Kirst

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 870 091

Paper commissioned by

THE STUDY GROUP ON THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF STUDIES

1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ROLES, GOVERNANCE, AND MULTIPLE USES
FOR A NEW NAEP

Michael W. Kirst
Stanford University

This paper is an attempt to synthesize several commissioned papers, regional meetings of the NAEP study group, the meetings of the study group, and comments to a first draft by the staff and consultants. The basic focus is the governance mechanisms, but the new role, functions, and uses of NAEP are the key to understanding a revised governance mechanism. The basic thesis is that the existing governance system was never designed for the new NAEP role and uses as envisioned in the papers by Haertel, Kearney, Wiley, Hathaway, Ferrara, Thornton, Bock, Wolf, and the San Francisco regional group. All of these commissioned papers are basically congruent with the San Francisco meeting, and have a common theme of linking NAEP through new technologies to international, state, and local users in a different way. The Hathaway paper provides one version of this in Figure I, although the San Francisco group did not envision the local assessment role as clearly as Hathaway.

(Figure I here)

In the 1978 law, NAEP was never intended to perform all these functions.* Indeed, NAEP was originally designed to make it "difficult if not impossible to link (NAEP) results to state or district programs or to grade-related practices in schools" (Messick, et al., as quoted by Ferrara/Thornton, p. 3). The whole idea of the San Francisco meeting was a multiple user focus of NAEP that included interstate comparisons and more explicit state and local curricular impact. NAEP's potential for assessing educational processes

*The NAEP law is in Appendix I and includes the membership as discussed later.

TM 820 971

FIGURE I

State or local district developed tests and testing systems demonstrated to have an adequate match to a National consensus core curriculum, but possibly extending beyond it.
L I N K E D ←→
National Item Banks and Scales.
Covering National consensus core curriculum in each subject as well as additional theoretically or practically desirable outcomes.
From the National Item Banks.
National Tests can be developed for administration to representative samples of classrooms nationwide.
L I N K E D ←→
Major commercially available tests and testing systems demonstrated to have an adequate match to a National consensus core curriculum and and to the possibly broader curricula of the state and/or local districts being assessed.
All of the local participation would be voluntary.

and inputs as suggested by Kearney is not addressed in this paper, but should be kept in mind.

Although I am not an expert in all these areas, it appears that the curricular domain development envisioned in the San Francisco paper is echoed in a similar manner by Bock (pp. 16-21), Wiley (pp. 13-15), Hathaway (pp. 2-8), Haertel, Ferrara, and to a lesser extent, Wolf. Bock's "duplex design" illustrates below what the San Francisco group meant by a NAEP constricted "conception of each subject area domain," which is the first tack of a reconstituted NAEP policy committee.

(Bock, p. 18 Figure II here)

Wiley states the new task of the NAEP Policy Committee in this way:

> In the past, NAEP has provided a partial model for some state assessments. These state efforts have borrowed items, procedures, and design elements from the national assessment. In the current climate, these past supports are insufficient.
>
> In order to support valid and useful monitoring and diagnosis of educational quality throughout the system, we must create an integrated, stable system within which subsystem goals (state and local) can be located and for which assessments are anchored in metrics and standards which are directly interpretable in national terms. (p. 14)

A reconstituted NAEP Policy Committee would have to oversee the design and construction of a linkage system relating commonly used local achievement tests and state assessment instruments to NAEP curricular domains and a NAEP measurement system. Test equating tables would need to be designed allowing state and local test subscales that could be converted to the metric of the NAEP measurement scales. All of these federal, state, and local roles were never envisioned as part of the 1978 NAEP Policy Committee's charge. Haertel sums up the new NAEP roles as follows:

Darell Bock, paper prepared for NAEP Study Group.

Figure II

A GRADE 8 MATHEMATICS DUPLEX DESIGN

		Proficiencies		
	Content Categories	a. Procedural Skills[a]	b. Factual Knowledge[b]	c. Higher Level Thinking[c]
10.	*Numbers*			
	Integers	11a	11b	11c
	Fractions	12a	12b	12c
	Percent	13a	13b	13c
	Decimals	14a	14b	14c
	Irrationals	15a	15b	15c
20.	*Algebra*			
	Expressions	21a	21b	21c
	Equations	22a	22b	22c
	Inequalities	23a	23b	23c
	Functions	24a	24b	24c
30.	*Geometry*			
	Figures	31a	31b	31c
	Relations & Transformations	32a	32b	32c
	Coordinates	33a	33b	33c
40.	*Measurement*			
	English & metric units	41a	41b	41c
	Length, area & volume	42a	42b	42c
	Angular measure	43a	43b	43c
	Other systems (time, etc.)	44a	44b	44c
50.	*Probability & Statistics*			
	Probability	51a	51b	51c
	Experiments & surveys	52a	52b	52c
	Descriptive Statistics	53a	53b	53c

[a]Calculating, rewriting, constructing, estimating, executing algorithms.

[b]Terms, definitions, concepts.

[c]Proof, reasoning, problem solving, real-world applications

> Such (curricular) domain descriptions and items pools could serve as a framework for linking the national assessment with state-level assessments; coordinating state and national assessments with other subject matter content development efforts (e.g., Holmes, Carnegie, College Board); informing deliberation on achievement standards and targets in education reform; communicating the meaning of these standards and targets; and coordinating and improving state-level curriculum planning. (p. 1)

New technologies such as IRT make all this feasible.

The federal government would fund collection of a biannual common core of outcomes for each state that would replace the "wall chart." A state could opt out of this common core but their absence would be highlighted in the annual presentation with a blank space and explanation. The states would not need to provide any money for this common core and could not offer dollars as an excuse for opting out.

Implications for NAEP Governance

Tyler's paper appears to assume no dramatic departures in NAEP's current role or statute. The papers cited above and the San Francisco meeting require statutory changes with related governance alterations. Much of the current statute concerning the Policy Committee, however, is congruent with the San Francisco meeting.

The current law (Public Law 95-561) as amended in 1981 starts with four primary purposes:

(A) collect and report at least once every five years data assessing the performance of students at various age or grade levels in each of the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics;

(B) report periodically data on changes in knowledge and skills of such students over a period of time;

(C) conduct special assessments of other educational areas, as the need for additional national information arises; and

(D) provide technical assistance to State educational agencies and to local educational agencies on the use of National Assessment objectives, primarily pertaining to the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and communication, and on making comparisons of such assessments with the national profile and change data developed by the National Assessment.

This section needs to be augmented with the new functions as envisioned in the San Francisco meeting with particular reference to development of national subject matter domains and item pools that can be linked to state and local assessments and curriculum if the states or locals so choose. At present NAEP helps states use the current NAEP test items, rather than pick from broader item pools that are more closely related to state or local curriculum policies as outlined in Hathaway's Figure I.

The Assessment Policy Committee

Section 1242 includes the Assessment Policy Committee (APC) and there is no reason not to keep this title. But its charge needs to be rewritten to encompass:

1. Domain conception and design of state and local test linkages as included in the papers cited previously.

2. Concepts for insuring that fair comparisons can be made among states and locals by taking different contexts into account.

3. Advice on the feasible and important achievement targets and performance standards at all three levels of education governance.

4. Design assistance to states and locals in supplementing state samples, linking nationally devised items with state and local assessment, and otherwise adapting test items from the national domain banks to meet particular state and local needs.

5. Provide assistance to groups devising related assessments, such as the Carnegie Teacher Board, College Board, and IEA.

The APC Committee itself would continue to have many of the members currently in PL 95-561, but would be augmented to include more than one CSSO, curricular specialists, and test experts. There would be fewer than the four classroom teachers in the statute, and one school principal. But the APC would not be part of the contracting organization. The APC would be appointed by the Secretary of Education, not the organization conducting the assessment as is currently the practice.

The statute would specify certain categories of individuals (e.g., Chief State School Officer) that would need to be selected. For each APC category, the Secretary would select from three candidates provided by a nominating panel. This panel would be composed of the following seven members (three state based, 4 national):

- National Governors Association
- National Conference of State Legislatures
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- National Academy of Education
- National Academy of Sciences
- Two members of each House of Congress

Individuals from these groups would not be representatives of their organizations. Rather, the nominating panel and the potential nominees would be "statesmen with the broad public interest" as their credo. An ex-governor with a deep interest in education would be an excellent nominee. The members of Congress should help with Congressional interest in NAEP and perhaps help secure funding.

Tyler suggests an alternative appointment by ECS, but ECS is largely staff run (along with the current governor who heads it for two years), and has a 50 state governance mechanism that meets only once a year. Another alternative for an appointing authority could be the National Academy of Education. The appointments would be for five rather than the current three years because the complexity of the added NAEP functions requires a longer tenure. The new APC would be rethinking the initial assumptions and functions of NAEP plus constructing new curricular domains and item pools.

The new APC would be responsible for establishing goals, objectives, guidelines, criteria, and oversight standards for a contractor (or contractors), who would: (a) design curricular domains; (b) design new assessments; (c) develop assessments; (d) devise formats for test reporting; (e) assist state and local assessments in a-d above (upon request), including concepts for fair comparisons among different contexts. The APC would not make any contracts with the testing contractor. This would be the responsibility of the Secretary of Education.

Tyler reports that the old APC under ECS had a panel on "how to select educational objectives." The San Francisco group envisioned panels for

each subject area that would select assessment objectives that the same panel would derive similar to the ECS procedures.

> ... a three step procedure was followed for each school subject. First specialists in the subject were asked to state what they considered important for students to learn, then school teachers and administrators were asked to review the list suggested by the specialists and identify what the schools were teaching. Finally, parents and interested laymen were asked to select what they considered important for their children to learn.

This revitalized APC would have under it other committees such as "exercise construction" for each curricular domain and "analysis" that ECS had at the outset of NAEP. The APC would appoint the members of these committees. Tyler reports that the analysis committee dealt with sampling problems as well as reporting and interpretation of assessment results and was used frequently (p. 12). ETS relies on in-house experts, a practice that Tyler criticizes for lack of range in expertise and "little incentive to question the concepts or procedures of the (ETS) staff."

The APC would have a sizeable staff (perhaps 10 professionals). An issue is where to house this staff so that their salaries and expense budget would be relatively immune from cutbacks of federal agencies. An Education Department locaion for the APC make it particularly vulnerable to other salary and expense priorities.

I favor establishing the entire APC and its staff in the federal government but outside the Department of Education. The appropriate model would be the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations (see ACIR in Appendix II). Consequently, the staff would be federal civil service except for the executive director who would be selected by the APC and approved by the Secretary.

Another possibility would be to house the APC staff with a contractor

like the National Academy of Sciences. This could be a fiscal agent relationship with APC, and other organizations would probably bid for such a contract. Perhaps bids could be solicited as a hedge against possible OMB resistance to forming another independent agency within the federal government such as ACIR. NAEP could make an unusual case for overcoming OMB's traditional resistance to new independent agencies.

It would take a number of years before the new NAEP envisioned in this paper could be mounted. The APC would be an applied R&D organization during its initial years. A continuation contract for the existing NAEP would need to be let by the federal government. States would be urged to use the SREB type mechanism for comparisons in 1988.

Test Administration and Analysis

Test administration and analysis might be carried out under a separate contract let by the APC, but perhaps the same contractor would work on both phases of test design and test administration. The functions of this test administration contractor are outlined on page 4 (a-c) of the San Francisco meeting report (version 3). There are some diseconomies of separating test administration and test development, but a broader field of potential bidders can be stimulated if the two functions are not inextricably linked. APC could specify how the analysis would be done, but the APC would not do the analysis. Who would provide technical assistance to the states and localities who wanted to link to this system? The most likely organization would be the test administration and analysis contractor. They would suggest item pools for state use and adapt them to state needs.

The test administration contractor would also be responsible for

sampling advice to the states. This has become a difficult technical issue because states want to cut costs by picking their own samples rather than using the more expensive Westat process. These different sampling procedures, however, can add to the complexity and validity of comparison between state and national results.

The state assessments need not be given at the same time as the national NAEP. This separation would mitigate delays in reporting results if both levels have to be reported simultaneously. The states would expand on a common national core of items. All states (unless they opted out from any participation in the entire NAEP enterprise) would give the common national core.

Overall Themes for the Report

This paper has focussed on governance and contracting issues. But governance should be considered in the broader context of the new NAEP that the Study Commission envisions. The outcome of our September meeting in Nashville is summarized below:

- NAEP has been useful but needs major reconceptualization.
- Major change in public desire for more comparative and performance data about schools, particularly interstate comparisons.
- New international economic competition requires more attention to international comparisons of education performance.
- New technologies allow a more ambitious role for national assessment and its ability to provide closer linkages and implications for state and local policy makers and citizens.
- NAEP has more potential for assisting in policy changes and use by policy makers than the current design permits.
- All of these changed conditions and new technologies were not anticipated when the current NAEP process was begun in the 1960s.

- NAEP should undergo a major rethinking and assume new responsibilities.

- The report envisions non-incremental change without losing the longitudinal NAEP data base. Current technology permits this.

- Our report will raise very high aspirations with a realization that the political process will water these down.

- The revisions of NAEP will cost a great deal more than we are currently spending. Currently, the national government is underfunding NAEP.

- Only the federal government can provide the resources for the plan that we envision. Collection of statistics is the basic and undisputed federal role.

- The formulation of a new NAEP is to be accomplished through a nationwide process of states, educators, and officials. This is distinctly different from a federal effort and a national curriculum from Washington.

- NAEP needs to forge closer linkages with state assessments, curriculum policy, and new teacher reform efforts.

- This will require a major overhaul of the NAEP policy council.

Appendix I

(1)

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

Grant or cooperative agreement. 20 USC 1221a.

SEC. 1242. Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) In addition to other responsibilities of the Institute under this section, the Institute shall carry out, by grant to or cooperative agreement (subject to the provisions of the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977) with a nonprofit education organization, a National Assessment of Educational Progress which shall have as a primary purpose the assessment of the performance of children and young adults in the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and communication. Such a National Assessment shall—

"(A) collect and report at least once every five years data assessing the performance of students at various age or grade levels in each of the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics;

"(B) report periodically data on changes in knowledge and skills of such students over a period of time;

"(C) conduct special assessments of other educational areas, as the need for additional national information arises; and

"(D) provide technical assistance to State educational agencies and to local educational agencies on the use of National Assessment objectives, primarily pertaining to the basic skills of reading, mathematics, and communication, and on making comparisons of such assessments with the national profile and change data developed by the National Assessment.

Management.

Assessment Policy Committee, establishment and membership.

"(2)(A) The education organization through which the Institute carries out the National Assessment shall be responsible for overall management of the National Assessment. Such organization shall delegate authority to design and supervise the conduct of the National Assessment to an Assessment Policy Committee established by such organization. The Assessment Policy Committee shall be composed of—

"(i) five members appointed by the education organization of whom two members shall be representatives of business and industry and three members shall be representatives of the general public, and

"(ii) twelve members appointed by the education organization from the categories of membership specified in subparagraph (B).

"(B) Members of the Assessment Policy Committee appointed in accordance with division (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall be—

"(i) one chief State school officer;

"(ii) two State legislators;

"(iii) two school district superintendents;

"(iv) one chairman of a State board of education;

"(v) one chairman of a local school board;

"(vi) one Governor of a State; and

"(vii) four classroom teachers.

"(C) The Director of the Institute shall serve as an ex officio member of the Assessment Policy Committee. The Director shall also appoint a member of the National Council on Education Research to serve as a nonvoting member of the Assessment Policy Committee.

"(D) Members appointed in accordance with divisions (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall be appointed for terms of three years except that (i) in the case of members appointed for fiscal year 1979, one third of the membership shall be appointed for terms of one year each and one third shall be appointed for terms of two years each, and (ii) appointments to fill vacancies shall be for such terms as

add new questions if state test - curricular influences

need to add members but general weight consistent with Sun Princeton meeting

remain unexpired. No member shall be appointed to serve more than two consecutive terms.

Duties.

"(3) The Assessment Policy Committee established by paragraph (2) shall be responsible for the design of the National Assessment, including the selection of the learning areas to be assessed, the development and selection of goal statements and assessment items, the assessment methodology, the form and content of the reporting and dissemination of assessment results, and studies to evaluate and improve the form and utilization of the National Assessment.

goal statements
Jessie what
Hoertel is talking
about.

Review.

"(4) Each learning area assessment shall have goal statements devised through a national consensus approach, providing for active participation of teachers, curriculum specialists, subject matter specialists, local school administrators, parents, and concerned members of the general public. All items selected for use in the assessment shall be reviewed to exclude items which might reflect racial, sex, cultural, or regional bias.

Stronger statement needed here in state role.

"(5) Participation in the National Assessment by State and local educational agencies selected as part of a sample of such agencies shall be voluntary.

Review, comments and report to Congress.

"(6) The Director of the Institute shall provide for a review of the National Assessment at least once every three years. This review shall provide an opportunity for public comment on the conduct and usefulness of National Assessment and shall result in a report to the Congress and to the Nation on the findings and recommendations, if any, stemming from the review.

Appropriation authorization.

"(7) There are authorized to be appropriated $10,500,000 for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983, to carry out the provisions of this subsection.".

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

SEC. 1243. (a) Section 406(g) of the General Education Provisions Act (as redesignated by section 1212(c)) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1978" both places it appears therein, and by inserting instead "October 1, 1983".

Ante, p. 2341.

(b)(1) Section 408(a) of such Act is amended by inserting "or by delegation of authority pursuant to law" immediately after "vested in him by law".

20 USC 1221e-3.

(2) Section 408(a)(1) of that Act is amended by inserting after "operation of" a comma and the following: "and governing the applicable programs administered by".

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEADS OF EDUCATION AGENCIES

Contracts, qualifications and terms, public availability.

SEC. 1244. Section 408 of the General Education Provisions Act is further amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The administrative head of an education agency shall ensure that, in contracting under the authority of this section for the services of independent persons in the competitive review of grant applications, all such persons are qualified, by education and experience, to perform such services. The qualifications of such persons and the terms of such contracts, other than information which identify such person, shall be readily made available to the public.".

(4) Section 408(d) of such Act (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) is amended by striking out "For the purposes of

for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, and $10,800,000 for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1989".

20 USC 1221e-1.

(b) Section 406(g) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1221-1(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "October 1, 1983" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The amount available for grants and contracts by the Assistant Secretary under subsection (e) shall not exceed $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, $14,000,000 for fiscal year 1987, $16,000,000 for fiscal year 1988, and $18,000,000 for fiscal year 1989.".

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

SEC. 703. (a) Section 405(k)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e(k)(1)) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by inserting after such subparagraph the following:

"(E) with respect to each State which voluntarily participates in accordance with paragraph (5), provide for a statement of information collected by the National Assessment for each such State.".

(b) Section 405(k)(3) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The appropriateness of all cognitive, background, and attitude items developed as part of the National Assessment shall be the responsibility of the Assessment Policy Committee. Such items shall be subject to review by the Department of Education and the Office of Management and Budget for a single period of not more than 60 days.".

COLLECTION OF DATA

SEC. 704. (a) Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) For purposes of this section, the terms 'United States' and 'State' include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.".

20 USC 1221e-1.

(b) Section 406 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1221-1) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) For purposes of this section, the terms 'United States' and 'State' include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.".

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS

SEC. 705. Section 417(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1226c(a)) is amended by striking out "November 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31".

CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST

SEC. 706. (a) Section 435(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (6);

Appendix II

What is ACIR?

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) was created by the Congress in 1959 to monitor the operation of the American federal system and to recommend improvements. ACIR is a permanent national bipartisan body representing the executive and legislative branches of Federal, state, and local government and the public.

The Commission is composed of 26 members—nine representing the Federal government, 14 representing state and local government, and three representing the public. The President appoints 20—three private citizens and three Federal executive officials directly and four governors, three state legislators, four mayors, and three elected county officials from slates nominated by the National Governors' Conference, the Council of State Governments, the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Counties. The three Senators are chosen by the President of the Senate and the three Congressmen by the Speaker of the House.

Each Commission member serves a two year term and may be reappointed.

As a continuing body, the Commission approaches its work by addressing itself to specific issues and problems, the resolution of which would produce improved cooperation among the levels of government and more effective functioning of the federal system. In addition to dealing with the all important functional and structural relationships among the various governments, the Commission has also extensively studied critical stresses currently being placed on traditional governmental taxing practices. One of the long range efforts of the Commission has been to seek ways to improve Federal, state, and local governmental taxing practices and policies to achieve equitable allocation of resources, increased efficiency in collection and administration, and reduced compliance burdens upon the taxpayers.

Studies undertaken by the Commission have dealt with subjects as diverse as transportation and as specific as state taxation of out-of-state depositories; as wide ranging as substate regionalism to the more specialized issue of local revenue diversification. In selecting items for the work program, the Commission considers the relative importance and urgency of the problem, its manageability from the point of view of finances and staff available to ACIR and the extent to which the Commission can make a fruitful contribution toward the solution of the problem.

After selecting specific intergovernmental issues for investigation, ACIR follows a multistep procedure that assures review and comment by representatives of all points of view, all affected levels of government, technical experts, and interested groups. The Commission then debates each issue and formulates its policy position. Commission findings and recommendations are published and draft bills and executive orders developed to assist in implementing ACIR policies.

Summary: Structure of National Assessment

The governance arrangements for a refashioned national assessment include (1) a nominating committee, (2) Policy Committee and its staff and (3) a contractor to administer tests.

A. Policy Committee Nominators

1. A nominating group would be established by statute to make recommendations for each vacancy on the Assessment Policy Committee. The group would be comprised of:

   - The chairs of the House and Senate education authorizing committees or a member of the House or the Senate designated by those individuals
   - The Governor chairman of the National Governors Association
   - The President of the Chief State School Officers Organization
   - The Chairman of the National Council of State Legislators
   - The President of the National Academy of Education
   - The President of the National Academy of Sciences.

2. The Nominating group would solicit names from their membership, other organizations interested in education and the general public and would recommend to the Secretary of Education at least 3 candidates for each position to be filled.

B. Assessment Policy Committee

1. The APC would be appointed by the Secretary from recommendations forwarded by the Nominating group. The membership totaling 21 (as at present) must represent experience (but not necessarily occupy present positions) as:

   - Governor
   - Chief State School Officer
   - State legislator
   - Local superintendent
   - Member of State board of education
   - Member of a local board of education
   - Classroom teachers
   - Representatives of business and industry
   - Curriculum planner or supervisor
   - Testing and measurement expert
   - Member, National Council for Educational Research (Designated by the Secretary)
   - Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement (Ex-officio)

2. Terms would be staggered, and five years in length after the initial appointments.

3. The Federal Government would award a grant for support of a staff so that responsibilities assigned to the APC could be carried out. Curriculum domain and objectives actions and also the goal setting and prescription of analysis functions.

4. The grant would be awarded to a nonprofit organization after review of responses to a grant competition announcement. Some group such as the following would be likely applicants:

   National Academy of Education
   National Academy of Sciences
   Council of Chief State School Officers
   Education Commission of the States
   Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

C. Test Contractor

1. The Federal Government would award a contract for support of all test development, test administration, test analysis, reporting of findings, item bank maintenance and assistance to States and local districts in supplementing tests or creating their own.

2. All of these responsibilities would be conducted to comply with the domains, objectives, test constructs and analysis plans prescribed by the APC.